United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Klamath Field Office
P.O. Box 1006
Yreka, CA 96097-1006

July 6, 1990

Memorandum

TO: Klamath Fishery Management Council

FROM: Ron Iverson

SUBJECT: Draft minutes of the Management Council meeting held May 17,18, 1990.

Attached for your review are minutes of the subject meeting held in La Jolla, California. I have followed each motion passed, assignment made, or other decision point with a line of asterisks.

There was discussion, during the May 17-18 meeting, of restricting distribution of proceedings of this meeting, on account of the preliminary nature of the options developed by the Council. We asked our Regional Solicitor whether we could do this, and were told on June 22 that the Federal Advisory Committee Act requires that detailed records of every advisory committee meeting must be made available to the public.

Attachment 9, the final harvest management plan for the 1990 fall chinook salmon gillnet fishery on the Yurok reservation, was received in this office on July 6, 1990. It replaces the draft harvest management plan (Attachment 7) discussed at the La Jolla Management Council meeting.

Attachments

cc: Interested parties

KLAMATH FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
DRAFT PROCEEDINGS
MEETING HELD 17-18 MAY 1990
LA JOLLA, CA

The meeting convened at 9 a.m. on May 17, with a quorum of members present (see attendance roster, Attachment 1). Mel Odemar was present as Spike Naylor's alternate.

Review of minutes and agenda.

The draft agenda for the 5/17-18 meeting was approved (Attachment 2).

Reviewing minutes of the meeting of 31 March/1 April 1990, Sue Masten noted they lack a handout she had provided at that meeting. (A copy of that handout will be attached to future meeting minutes once she provides us a copy.) Alan Baracco also provided corrections: page 11, 2nd paragraph should define CPUE as "Catch Per Unit Effort"; page 28, line 11 should read "(Barraco): Reminds council that model run had not been reviewed by KRTAT or STT relative to effort distribution due to Oregon proposal."

Review of planning system and previous planning results (Mackett).

Dave summarized the planning process from the beginning to the point the Council will try to reach in this meeting:

- Identify mission and charge of the Council (done).
- Identify and organize issues (done).
- Identify and organize goals (done).
- Generate options (actions) to satisfy goals.
- Organize them into an options field.
- Drafters provide a graphic of the options field.
- Develop criteria for workable systems.
- Develop three preliminary alternative systems, each by a separate group of Council members.
- Present rationale for each alternative.
- Discuss future steps.

Summarizing planning work accomplished to date, Dave reviewed:

- The Council mission and functions provided by the Klamath Act and summarized by Gary Smith at the January meeting (see Attachment 5 to minutes of the meeting of January 4-6, 1990).

- The planning concept under which we are working (see Attachment 3 to January notes).

- The structured set of about 50 issues (see Attachment 9, January notes).

- The goals set, organized into fundamental and symptomatic goals (see Attachment 13, January notes). The trigger question in structuring goals asked whether achievement of goal x would significantly support achievement of goal y.

At this point Dave asked the Council to review the goals set, and raise any questions on meanings of goals. Some goals conflict with others. One future plan step will be a tradeoff analysis to decide which of the conflicting goals to pursue, and to what degree... as it is often possible to at least partly achieve two conflicting goals.

Comments on goals:

(Fullerton): Concerned we may get trapped in unproductive pursuit of conflicting goals.

(Martin): See three groups of goals in January's Attachment 13: Management process goals on the left, goals for refinement of technical data and methods in the middle, and goals dealing with allocation and fairness to the right. The Council tends to argue over process and technical goals, which detracts from negotiation of fairness goals... so perhaps the three goals groups should be segregated, dealt with separately. (Mackett): Not a good idea, because something may be lost if goals are discussed outside the context of other goals... could lead to suboptimal solutions. Looking at goals holistically, as part of a unified structure, is the desired process but is quite difficult... may need help from Technical Advisory Team.

(Mackett): The goals structure is always open to change, augmenting.

(Odemar): Note the standard in the Klamath Act for "an escapement that preserves or strengthens the viability of the Area's <u>natural</u> anadromous fish populations". This implies that, if we have goals that conflict between emphasizing harvest and emphasizing natural stock restoration, the latter should be given priority.

(Marshall): The lefthand and middle groups of goals in Attachment 13 are mostly the responsibility of the Task Force or Tech Team, while we are mostly responsible for the righthand goals. This leaves us dependent on others, leaves us no control over achievement. Perhaps the goals should be restructured. (Mackett): Just because those left and middle goals are in someone else's bailiwick doesn't change the fact that their achievement is prerequisite to achieving the righthand goals. (Marshall): I am saying that we need to achieve goals 18, 3, 12, etc. before we can accomplish the lefthand goals.

(Bingham): Will we go through the same process of clarifying and structuring options that we used for issues and goals? (A: Yes.) Will we continue to deal with all goals or pick a few generic ones? (A: All goals.)

(Bingham): The Task Force, in its planning, is struggling with restoration of natural stocks. Issues include how finely to split or lump these stocks, and how to deal with harvest impacts on them. Keith and I feel it is a Council -- rather than a Task Force -- responsibility to plan for management of harvest of these stocks.

(Martin): I'm having trouble envisioning an option that somehow takes all these goals into account. If the option includes controversial allocation issues along with technical ones, controversy could taint the technical actions and prevent us from going ahead with them. (Mackett): We don't want to combine several actions in one option. Each option should be a simple statement, with minimal use of "and". Don't worry about coming up with conflicting options... this won't stop our planning. In some cases, technical staff can clear up apparent conflicts.

(Mackett): Does anyone see a goal in Attachment 13 that the Council should not pursue?

(Reed): Don't see any undesirable goals, but some appear redundant, could be combined. Other goals are impossible to achieve, although progress could be made toward them. (Mackett): Truly redundant goals may be combined, although some have subtle but real differences in meaning. Suggest the Tech Team be assigned to refine the wording of goals, identify redundancy and highlight true differences.
****

(Mackett): I conclude you feel there are no goals in Attachment 13 that should be eliminated at this time, and I don't hear any new goals to be added.
****

<u>Generation and clarification of options for meeting the goals</u>.

(Mackett): Next step is options generation, followed by structuring of options into an options field. Each option needs a supporting rationale. Collections of several options from the options field constitute alternative courses of action. Another step is writing criteria for comparing and rating alternatives. Using criteria, a best alternative design will be chosen, followed by a plan for implementing -- an action plan. Development of implementation methods might best be turned over to technical staff. Methods for monitoring/evaluation must also be developed.

(Fullerton): There will be a public review step also, with Federal Register notice and other formal steps. We need to determine what these steps should be.
****

(Reed): Suggest we take the Task Force fishery restoration plan as a given, meaning we can rely on others to develop and implement options for habitat restoration... we need not do that work.

(Mackett): We will develop options by introducing a new trigger question, generating ideas silently, recording ideas in round robin sequence, clarifying ideas... just as we did for issues and goals. NEW TRIGGER QUESTION: "In the context of developing a long-term strategy that meets KFMC goals, what options should be considered?"

Discussion ensued as to what an option should consist of. Mackett referred to the last page of Attachment 4 of the January notes, consisting of an options field for albacore management. One rule of thumb: keep options simple.

Round robin generation of options yielded the options listed below. Clarifying comments and questions were raised after options generation was completed, but are grouped here with the appropriate options, to streamline things.

---

1. (Bingham): Coordinated seasonal management.

   Clarification: I refer to a change from the present mix of seasonal and quota management, both inriver and ocean, to fisheries managed by time and area, with quotas eliminated. Benefits: All harvesters would share in the gain or loss from unanticipated abundance or scarcity.

   Q: Do you mean control of effort of individuals to achieve a desired overall harvest rate?
   A: No. My option proposes time/area management, not bag limits.

   Q: What if this option wouldn't work to achieve a target harvest rate?
   A: Don't want to qualify the option with any "if" clauses... I am trying to address the inriver concern about not being able to share in unanticipated abundance.

   Q: Are you speaking of management regulations to be adjusted yearly?
   A: Yes.

2. (Reed): Devise monitoring program that enables instantaneous estimate of harvest status of all stocks.

   Clarification: I refer to the mixed-stock ocean fishery. If we knew, instantaneously, which stocks were being harvested and at what rates, maybe inseason adjustments could be made. I realize that new technology may be needed to enable this.

   Q: Would your objective be to refine estimates of ocean stock size?
   A: Objective would be inseason ocean management... refining the regulations with stock-specific harvest information that would be analyzed soon -- a week, say -- after actual harvest.

Q: Besides ocean stock size estimates, would you update estimates of time/area stock distribution? Of contribution rate of Klamath fish?
A: Yes... assume information on Klamath stocks would begin to come in from the Fort Bragg fishery first, then shift northward.

(Odemar): If you are speaking of identifying the stock composition of the ocean catch, we will soon be able to do that, using genetic stock identification.

3. (Hayden): Form a Klamath River Basin producer's cooperative.

Clarification: I foresee a group that both harvests and manages production and harvest. Members could include both harvesters and agencies, and maybe landowners impacted by fishery constraints, such as timber harvesters. There could be different types of memberships, with different kinds and levels of benefit coming back to the different types of members. Maybe different members could hold various amounts of shares in the co-op.

Q: A marketing cooperative?
A: Yes, but the co-op would include more than market harvesters... sport fishers, too.

Q: Would the co-op run hatcheries?
A: Yes. Maybe the KFMC could essentially be the co-op.

Q: Would the co-op allocate harvest, or perhaps distribute an allocation given to it in some manner... say, to maximize economic benefit to members?
A: An analogy would be the agricultural co-ops that produce and market.

Q: Would it be a commune, getting the sale receipts and dividing them among members?
A: Harvesters could get their own receipts, but also get dividends from the co-op.

(Reed): Information transfer could be part of the cooperative effort.

Q: Do you envision a broadened version of the salmon stamp program, where some of the receipts are donated to the common good?
A: Yes. For example, timber harvesters would have more incentive to protect habitat if they got part of the harvest returns.

Q: Explain how income would be distributed.
A: One use of income would be to substitute rewards for the present system of fines and punishments. A landowner could be compensated for good practices.

4. (Masten): Seek funds for improved inseason data collection.

Clarification: We need better data on all stocks, yet we hear agencies are taking funding cuts. We need to seek adequate funds.

Q: Do you mean data on Klamath stocks, or on other parts of the mixed stock fishery as well?
A: Could include other stocks if that information is needed for Klamath management.

5. (Wilkinson): Proposal for additional hatchery (ies) in Klamath River basin.

Clarification: We need to construct more hatcheries to increase harvest. One harvest goal that has been proposed is 100-150,000 chinook harvested annually in the KMZ, and a like amount inriver.

Q: What about competition with natural stocks?
A: Believe we can minimize that with release strategies.

Q: Would you include the low-technology projects such as the Hoopa Tribe is conducting, using local broodstock?
A: Yes, but I don't think those will be enough... we need more large hatcheries.

6. (Bostwick): Production of more fish (hatcheries)... target fisheries on hatchery stock while strengthening natural stocks.

Clarification: We can reduce conflict between harvesters by increasing fish abundance.

(Marshall): That doesn't seem to have happened in recent experience.

7. (Martin): Manage escapement to produce MSY (Maximum Sustainable Yield) for each Klamath river run, while preventing extinction of any Klamath River tributary subpopulation.

Clarification: We need to focus on maximizing yield, with the constraint of not allowing stock extinctions, because the progressive loss of small subpopulations will reduce the robustness of the overall fish population. I don't refer to preserving stock integrity for every small creek, but for the major subpopulations.

Q: Doesn't this conflict with your option 42?
A: No. Option 42 means that, below some level of abundance, we will stop managing for MSY of natural stocks... but would still continue to manage to prevent their extinction. Our harvest management would, for low abundance of natural stocks, be managed for hatchery stocks.

Q: Are you willing to reference habitat in this option, in order to flag it for Task Force action, and to acknowledge that harvesters shouldn't have the whole burden of reaching MSY?
A: Yes. Steps I envision include: monitoring subpopulations, identifying the really depressed ones -- like Shasta fall chinook -- then look at

options to restore them... which could include reduced harvest and habitat restoration.

(Bingham): Don't forget short-term fixes, such as our proposal for a hatchery at Big Springs.

(Fullerton): Need to inform Task Force of their part in implementing this option.

8. (Odemar): Require water releases adequate to achieve optimal productivity of the basin.

Clarification: I was thinking of Trinity flows... should change "releases" to "flows".

(Fullerton): This is a habitat action outside our purview... it is not an option for us.

(Martin): I expect we will produce a longterm plan and policy that says we will manage for restoration of natural stocks. This only works well if the productivity of all major stocks is about the same. If there is one stock with very low productivity because of degraded habitat in that subbasin, we can: write that stock off; reduce the level of harvest on all stocks to sustain the low one; or get the productivity of that weak stock restored by getting the habitat problems fixed.

9. (Warrens): Mandate by law minimum habitat standards.

Clarification: Our harvest plan will never work if habitat can be grossly degraded as with Trinity flows. We need minimum standards for all practices affecting fish habitat, including land use.

Q: Do you mean a list of measures to provide to Congress to get enacted into law? A: Yes.

10. (Bingham): Mark all Klamath fish.

Clarification: This keys into targeting hatchery stocks. At this point, I am not identifying what type of mark. After catch in ocean is reached, Klamath stocks could be released.

11. (Reed): Finetune allocation by allowing fishing in all salmon spawning rivers.

Clarification: Instead of punitive action for catching Klamath fish, encourage targeting fish from other rivers. Suggested that: If we really want to manage Klamath stocks and if this would be one mechanism for not being so punitive on the troll fishery then let's try it.

(Odemar): Commented that California made a decision in 30's & 40's to not follow this path. Recognize that this kind of recommendation would fire this into a much larger arena, possibly voters ...

12. (Hayden): Match species to basin production potential.

13. (Hayden): Identify various potential mixes.

14. (Hayden): Make four interim, and one longterm allocation.

Clarification: (Options 12, 13, and 14 go together). Within the Klamath River Basin different fish are produced in different areas, these options would look at the mix of each species, inventory what's possible and then make allocations on how to get this mix.

(Martin): The end point would be to balance the potentially achievable mix.

(Hayden): This option would provide the biologically & physically best mix, emphasizing wild fish.

Q: Are you looking at how to get the best mix of hatchery and natural? The tech team is now looking at how to get optimal mix.
A: Yes, part of this is being done, but we need to look at the long term.

15: (Masten): Increase timely communication on agency management practices.

Clarification: We need to know the yearly management changes so that comments can be made.

Q: Would this include water releases, fish releases, etc?
Q: Does this mean between members of the council?
A: Yes to both.

16. (Wilkinson): Implement minimum streamflow standards.

Clarification: In the long term, this Council will be a significant political force. We should identify what the flows should be, then address the political challenge.

(Martin): Referring to what's happening on the Columbia: everybody gets together and decides on optimal flow when low flows are an issue. This is what we lack on the Klamath River. We lack an overall plan on the flow need for each tributary.

Q: Do you mean "appropriate" flow regimes instead of "minimum"?
A: Yes.

(Odemar): If we are to "restore Klamath fish stocks", we need "x" flows, if they drop below that then we cannot do the job that the legislation asked us to.

17. (Bostwick): Develop regulations that allow users access to the stocks.

Clarification: We need regulations that will give us the ability to access the stocks.

Q: What stocks?
A: For inriver it would be Klamath River stock, for ocean it would be mixed stock.

18. (Martin): Establish a 2-tiered allocation system...
    Tier 1: Absolute minimum needs for each user group,
    Tier 2: Allocate between user groups to maximize total economics of Klamath basin.

Clarification: Needs and political pressure drive the allocation shift. The alternative would be for the public to judge a system as productive to the whole. Maximum net economic benefit to the nation could work, but other priorities may also be important. The net economic value per fish would be determined.

(Bingham): Seems like a benefit for economists. This is an interesting approach that I'm not opposed to.

(Marshall): Indian fishing rights existed before this country existed, any economic basis that changes this is not acceptable.

(Martin): Understands indian fishing rights. The problem is that "meeting rights" is not defined equally by all people. The problem is that no definition of "meeting rights" exists, the alternatives are to either get the economists to decide on a definition or the courts will.

(Wilkinson): If the true value of fish was known, they would be managed very differently than they are today.

(Warrens): The Magnuson Act shows that economics play an important role in deciding allocation.

(Martin): Believes that the problem with the current management scheme is that is has an unstable foundation. This instability is caused by an unclear understanding among the user groups. We need an objective set of values in order to come to an understanding of the management system.

19. (Odemar): Direct all in-river harvests to hatchery stocks only.

Clarification: This is easily done with steelhead. There are problems with doing this for all salmon.

20. (Marshall): Simplify process by managing the Klamath River fishery the same as the co-managed fisheries north of Cape Falcon.

Clarification: This council needs to understand that this is not one nation, but 2-3 nations. This is recognized above Cape Falcon, the legal precedent has already been established. This council can recognize this precedence and use it as an example of how to conduct business. We

shouldn't have the same types of problems that occurred above Falcon because there are only 2 tribes involved here. We'll need to look at the Executive Orders to fill the void, and clarify the entitlement.

(Martin): In my mind these sovereign nations do exist. It is clear that they are managers, although it is not clear that they deserve 50% of the harvest. I'm tired of hearing Boldt language which does not apply here in California.

(Warrens): The situation above Cape Falcon is more complex because of the numbers of people. The Klamath is more simplistic, and this makes the issues more complex.

(Fullerton): This is not the place to decide indian rights.

(Masten): Feels that this option needs to remain as an option because it addresses equity among the users. This is an underlying problem, it will stay on the table.

(Mackett): Yes, it will stay on the table, and go through the process.

(Fullerton): Does not want to debate the Executive Order, we are not the people to debate this.

(Marshall): Bottom line is that I am frustrated by seeing indian fishing rights trampled to the ground. The issue of decisions based on economics ignores our rights.

21. (Warrens): Mandate dispute resolution by mediation/arbitration process.

Clarification: This is intended to be an alternative to full blown court battles to settling disputes.

Q: How would this work for this group given that we are not a decision making group? We are a recommending group.
A: The mediation process would decide the recommendation.

(Martin): This would force a recommendation by the arbitration board.

(Reed): This is just another option to help make a decision.

22. (Bingham): Share trading system.

Clarification: Nobody loves this idea. It is similar to the co-op idea, of using in-river fisheries as an equity balance, with the option of purchasing live fish.

Q: Were you thinking of a one-way trade or a buy out?
A: No, this option would not be a buy out. The indian fishers would sell part of their allocation to the trollers who would catch the fish in the ocean.

(Masten): No, that is not a viable option. The Yurok fishery will never sell its right to fish.

(Martin): It is their civil right, it is not for sale.

(Bingham): I respect that, but the possibility exists that this could change.

23. (Reed): Buyout or tradeout of indian commercial fishery.

Clarification: This option is similar to #22. It is a simple solution to an economic problem. This is meant to be a permanent one time buy out of the indian commercial fishery.

(Masten): The legislation that split the reservation said that the fish are for the Yuroks.

(Fullerton): Would a check in compensation for fish be acceptable?

(Masten): No, the fish are economically and culturally valuable to the tribe.

(Marshall): Look at the Klamath tribe, they are poverty stricken after selling their fishery.

(Fullerton): Yes, they sold their land base, but this is an issue of buying the "right".

(Martin): This isn't an issue of commercial fishing being "business" and in-river being "business", "lifestyle" etc. The commercial fishing industry is not only business, it does include "lifestyle" too.

(Fullerton): The economic value should not be the only decision point that we base this on. For example: the value of commercial fishing is only $70 million, as opposed to the value of recreational fishing at $550 million. If economics was the only consideration, there would be no trollers.

(Warrens): The disparity between the values of coho and steelhead is great. Troll and recreational values are approximately the same for chinook.

[In later discussion Reed defers to #22, will wipe out #23 and keep #22.]

24. (Hayden): Develop method to immediately identify hatchery fish.

Clarification: This option is a subset of Nat's (mark all Klamath fish). This option would target hatchery fish for sale.

(Warrens): Mortality and expense could lead to diminishing returns. Couldn't you extrapolate based on a marking sample?

(Odemar): The problem with recommendations for marking fish is that we need to decide standards for why first. That is, define the uses of the information.

25: (Masten): Develop MSY through harvest rate management.

26. (Bostwick): Public involvement in problem solving strategies.

Clarification: We need to have people understand our process, and the political process. If they rarely come to meetings then it is hard for them to understand. Maybe we should pull this option because if we can't decide, how can the public?

(Warrens): Constituents first need to have an understanding of the decision-making process. It is your job to contact and inform the key people in your constituency of what went on and why.

27. (Martin): Improve harvestability of hatchery fish by altering stocks, release locations, and by finclipping.

Clarification: The whole idea of finclipping is to increase the harvestability of hatchery fish, other options exist to target hatchery stocks, including relocating stocks.

(Bingham): This type of thing is done on the Sacramento River. Hatchery fish are being trucked past hazards. It is a successful program.

28. (Odemar): Institute ITQ (Individual transferable quotas) system for KMZ troll salmon.

Clarification: In the KMZ, ITQ's would be "worth" more fish when used outside the KMZ (based on the expected lower contribution of Klamath fish when trolling outside the KMZ).

[Subscript: ITQ's consist of an allotment of fish -- Klamath chinook for example -- for a particular zone that could be transferred to another zone. When used in an area outside the original zone, the ITQ could be "worth" a different number of fish.]

(Bingham): This option is not supported by troll industry.

(Odemar): These are options of management tools that might be used in the future.

29. (Marshall): Buyout/tradeout of KMZ troll/sport fishery.

No clarification needed.

(Masten): Heard that the small operator who is struggling may be interested in this.

(Reed): This may be worth considering, marginal operators may step aside.

Q: How would you propose to buy out sport fishing?
A: I don't have an answer for that.

30. (Warrens): Amend KFMC decision process to decide by 2/3 majority.

Clarification: Options would be decided by 2/3 majority instead of consensus. Veto would be provided by 4 votes instead of one. Typically the controversy is between inriver and ocean representatives. The reasoning for suggesting this change in the number of people needed to reflect majority is that it would cause the KFMC to become more credible (by making decisions that they have not yet made). Two-thirds seems to be an equitable representation of votes to make a decision.

[Later discussion changed this to require at least two dissenting votes to create a veto.]

31. (Bingham): Buy out or trade out trollers.

Clarification: (Prefaced remarks with a story about the buy-out that occurred in Sausalito: some trollers were offered $50K for their boat and license (while the market value is only 30K), and declined, showing that the lifestyle is worth more than earnings. Others were anxious to sell.) Yes, a buy-out program is wanted by people who don't see a future. Referred to the last meeting when many trollers expressed their wishes to be bought out. (Home port has little to do with where you fish because it changes throughout the season.)

32. (Reed): Permanent closure of KMZ.

Clarification: We must face up to the realization that there are not enough Klamath fish to meet the needs of the people. One solution is closing the KMZ.

(Martin): Need to consider that we may not be able to legally close the KMZ under the Magnuson Act. A better solution might be to take the whole coast and just automatically close June (for example) because it is more geographically fair.

Q: Are you also talking about the ocean recreational fishery? A: No.

(Wilkinson): The ocean recreational fishery, in Northern California and Southern Oregon, needs access to the KMZ.

(Bingham): Opposes due to fairness, this option would need to also include the recreational fishery.

(Reed): Would like to strike this option. This is not viable because of the information showing fish movements.

[#32 later replaced with: "Manage all ocean fisheries consistent with Klamath River natural production."]

33. (Hayden): Develop new sorting and harvest methods.

Clarification: This would involve marking, taking the fish alive, then sorting and releasing hatchery or wild, or whatever were targeted.

(Martin): Some advice on encouraging selective harvest: one way that works is to provide people the option based on economic reciprocation, because penalties don't work. Suggests that we explore incentives rather than using a punitive approach.

34: (Fullerton): Develop a terminal fishery.

Clarification: One extreme action for this option would be putting in a weir and dividing up the fish. This action would not be very socially acceptable.

35. (Masten): Expand boundaries of the KMZ.

Clarification: Expanding boundaries would increase the contribution rate.

(Bingham): The model already has a Coos Bay cell and a Ft. Bragg cell.

(Martin): This seems like it would dampen catch more.

36. (Martin): Use ITQs of wild Klamath fall chinook equivalents to manage all fisheries (in-river and ocean).

Clarification: This option of using Individual Transferable Quotas would involve each fisherman having "x" number of Klamath fish that were theirs, then they could decide ways to make this into more fish, by trading ITQ's etc.

(Bingham): Clarifies that the key emphasis in on individuals instead of groups, takes management decisions away from groups and gives them to individuals.

(Masten): Fish are a tribal resource, not an individual resource.

(Martin): If there was a base allocation to each group, then that group would decide how to allocate within its subunit.

Q: How would you actually do this? Wouldn't there have to be some kind of monitoring system?
A: Yes.

37. (Odemar): Manage all ocean salmon fisheries consistent with natural productivity.

Clarification: A lot of problems are based on Klamath stocks being based on an ocean harvest of .35, other stocks are based on .7 to .8. This

STATE OF CALIFORNIA—THE RESOURCES AGENCY

GEORGE DEUKMEJIAN, *Governor*

DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

[redacted]OX 944209
[redacted]MENTO, CALIFORNIA 94244-2090
([redacted]) 445-4088

July 19, 1990

Dr. Ron Iverson
Klamath Field Office
U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
P.O. Box 1006
Yreka, CA 96097

Re: Correction to May 17-18 Minutes

Dear Ron:

My statement on page 15 should read as follows:

[redacted]n average two-thirds of the fish spawning in the Klamath River are naturally produced. The system still has the definite ability to produce fish naturally.

I realize this is contrary to what most folks think is happening, but this is what our studies show.

Sincerely,

Mel Odemar
State/Federal Coordinator

causes disparity, if the ocean harvest rate was cut down, it might cause higher productivity.

38. (Marshall): Regulate effort shifts to reserve KMZ allocation for local fishermen .

Clarification: Effort shift usually causes the KMZ quotas to be caught within a week. Thinks that people would be better off if they fished out of their own port.

(Bingham): The small part time fishermen would support this idea (minor component of industry), the full time fishermen (the ones that move) would not like it as much. People always moved around, even before the zone was closed.

(Marshall): This is a problem, that needs to be sorted out.

(Bingham): We are trying to sort this out.

39. (Bingham): Manage all Klamath River salmon fisheries consistent with natural productivity. (Same as #37 except substitute "river" for "ocean").

40. (Hayden): Manage all ocean activities consistent with Klamath River natural production.

(Wilkinson): Contended that so-called natural fish are mostly hatchery runts, released at pre-smolt size. There is a need to diversify the program from unfed fry, smolts, pre-smolts.

(Masten): The definition of natural fish: if a hatchery fish spawns in the wild, then its progeny are wild.

(Odemar): Two-thirds of the fish spawning in the Klamath River are hatchery fish, although the system still has the definite ability to produce fish naturally.

(Fullerton): Clarifies that hatcheries release fish as the quantity of fish outgrow building facilities. Released fish are not graded out, so they can't be called runts.

41. (Masten): Establish a 50% split between Indian and non-Indian harvestable fish.

Clarification: Preface this option with the word "minimum".

(Marshall): Clarifies that the Hoopa tribe has never asked for any less or any more than the longterm harvest allocation plan for the Klamath -- that amount that was agreed to.

(Masten): It is important to know that our goal is clearly stated to be a minimum of 50%.

Q: (Martin) Is it reasonable to assume a 30% share would be agreeable to the Hoopas in the long term or is this just a 5 year agreement?
A: (Marshall) I can't say what our situation will be at the next 5 year segment.

42. (Martin): Establish a threshold for natural stock productivity below which we will re-examine the goals of managing for natural fish.

Clarification: This is the concept of managing for natural productivity in cases where habitat is poor. He has a helpless feeling of being bound by 99-552 and PFMC to manage for natural stocks, but being constrained by water flows and logging caused erosion. The people who are making the decision in the long run are not us... we will manage for the MSY of natural stocks as long as they remain within this bound of productivity.

(Fullerton): Very bad option. This would open the door to doing everything with hatchery stocks.

(Martin): Feels that he would use this the other way around: that we can't reach this goal without water.

Q: Is the threshold the flow?
A: No, it would be the stock not being capable of continuing. Either improve the habitat or something else. This forces accountability of people who are destroying the habitat.

43. (Bingham): Establish .50 ocean harvest rate.

44. (Masten): Open all commercial fishing to full seasonal management.

Clarification: This is a radical position to get us back to the table.

45. (Masten): Close all commercial fishing for 4 years.

Clarification: This is another radical position to get us back to the table.

46. (Bingham): Close all fishing for 4 years.

Clarification: If we are going to employ radical methods, then everybody should participate in this practice. Feels he is echoing comments made by public at the Eureka public meeting.

(Martin): When this recent exchange of options was generated and listed, he felt that people were getting extreme. Would the authors like to revise or delete these?

(Mackett): Let's let these options remain on the list for now.

(Mackett): Asked everyone to ask themselves: is there another option that I would like to see put into the hopper?

Options generated later:

47. (Bingham): Recommend to the Klamath River Basin Task Force habitat and/or bioenhancement measures for basin stocks found by KFMC to be weak relative to general basin productivity.

Clarification: This addresses coordination between the two working groups. Let's flag areas of concern and send these to KRBTF.

48. (Odemar): Institute a coastwide GSI (genetic stock identification) ocean landing sampling program to determine stock composition of ocean landings.

Clarification: Included this as a step to support Lisle's option #2.

49. (Bingham): Amend escapement goal rate to include a ceiling.

Clarification: If a lot of fish come in then, that's enough. At this time he is not offering quantification, just the idea.

(Odemar): This is already included in Amendment 10. It is not really a true ceiling.

(Reed): The attempt seems worthy.

Conclusion of Generation and Clarification of Options.

Discussion ensued as to whether the options apply to all anadromous stocks. Some members said many options seem to fit only salmon stocks.

(Hayden): Sees how these options could apply to chinook, but how would they apply to other anadromous stocks (sturgeon, etc)?

(Mackett): These goals are based on all anadromous species, the specifics are not yet decided.

Structure Options into an Options Field.

(Mackett): Trigger Question #2 is: In the context of designing a harvest management system for the Klamath River basin, is option x similar to option y? We will now discuss similarity between pairs of options, using the ISM method, as we did with issues and goals. Comments are summarized for each couplet of options.

Is option 2 similar to option 1?
- o One is a technical method, the other is part of harvest management.

Consensus: No.

Is option 3 similar to option 1?
Consensus: No.

Is option 3 similar to option 2?
Consensus: No.

Is option 4 similar to option 1?
Consensus: No.

Is option 4 similar to option 2?
- One option helps implement the other; getting funds is a necessary step.
- Both relate to data collection.

Consensus: Yes.

Is option 5 similar to option 1?
Consensus: No.

Is option 5 similar to option 2?
Consensus: No.

Is option 5 similar to option 3?
- There could be a similarity, depending on how Hayden defines a cooperative. (Hayden): I see some relationship... the cooperative might use hatcheries as a means to get more harvest.
- Hatcheries could be a tribal industry.
- The cooperative could operate hatcheries, but the two options aren't similar.

Consensus: No.

Is option 6 similar to option 1?
Consensus: No.

Is option 6 similar to option 2?
Consensus: No.

Is option 6 similar to option 3?
Consensus: No.

Is option 6 similar to option 5?
- Yes. The purpose of additional hatcheries is to produce more fish.
- No. Option 6 speaks to strengthening natural stocks.

Consensus: Yes.

Is option 7 similar to option 1?
- 7 deals with escapement, 1 with harvest.

Consensus: No.

Is option 7 similar to option 2?
Consensus: No.

Is option 7 similar to option 3?
Consensus: No.

Is option 7 similar to option 5?
Consensus: No.

Is option 8 similar to option 1?
- One relates to habitat, one to harvest.

Consensus: No.

Is option 8 similar to option 2?
Consensus: No.

Is option 8 similar to option 3?
Consensus: No.

Is option 8 similar to option 5?
- One connection is that, if we fail to protect flows needed by natural stocks, only hatchery stocks may remain viable.
- Both options increase fish production.
- Agree...these are two strategies to increase production.
- Flows are needed for movement of hatchery fish, too.
- Strategies are not similar... one promotes natural stocks, the other substitutes hatchery production in place of naturals.

Consensus: No.

Is option 8 similar to option 7?
Consensus: No.

Is option 9 similar to option 1?
Consensus: No.

Is option 9 similar to option 2?
Consensus: No.

Is option 9 similar to option 3?
Consensus: No.

Is option 9 similar to option 5?
- Both produce more fish.
- See no similarity between hatcheries and protecting natural habitat.

Consensus: No.

Is option 9 similar to option 7?
- One deals with harvest, one with habitat.

Consensus: No.

Is option 9 similar to option 8?
- Both are habitat issues.

Consensus: Yes.

Is option 10 similar to option 1?
- Only relationship is that information from option 10 could serve option 1.

Consensus: No.

Is option 10 similar to option 2?
Consensus: Yes.

Is option 11 similar to option 1?
- Option 11 would be a major management change statewide... option 1 would be a minor change from present management.

Consensus: No.

Is option 11 similar to option 2?
Consensus: No.

Is option 11 similar to option 3?
Consensus: No.

Is option 11 similar to option 5?
Consensus: No.

Is option 11 similar to option 7?
- Yes. Both options deal with management of inriver fisheries, and shifting to terminal fisheries would help protect natural stocks.
- Agree, if terminal fisheries were able to select hatchery from natural stocks.
- (Reed): My intent in option 11 was to reduce the waste of Sacramento and Rogue stocks that may result from management of ocean fisheries for Klamath stocks.
- Both options regulate escapement.

Consensus: Yes.

Is option 12 similar to option 1?
Consensus: No.

Is option 12 similar to option 3?
- Option 12 is something a cooperative could implement.

Consensus: No.

Is option 12 similar to option 5?
- Yes. In adding hatcheries, one consideration is matching species to production potential.

Consensus: Yes.

Is option 13 similar to option 1?
Consensus: No.

Is option 13 similar to option 2?
Consensus: No.

Is option 13 similar to option 3?
Consensus: No.

Is option 13 similar to option 5?
- Yes. Some combinations of stocks might call for a bigger hatchery component.
- Thought "potential mixes" referred to natural stocks.

Consensus: No.

Is option 13 similar to option 7?
- o Yes. Assessment of msy would be guided by information on potential mixes of stocks.

Consensus: Yes.

Is option 14 similar to option 1?
- o Both have to do with allocation.
- o No, 14 deals with allocation, and 1 with seasonal management toward an allocation that is already established.

Consensus: No.

Is option 14 similar to option 2?
Consensus: No.

Is option 14 similar to option 3?
Consensus: No.

Is option 14 similar to option 5?
Consensus: No.

Is option 14 similar to option 7?
- o Some relationship... both are steps in management.

Consensus: No.

Is option 14 similar to option 8?
Consensus: No.

Is option 15 similar to option 1?
Consensus: No.

Is option 15 similar to option 2?
Consensus: No.

Is option 15 similar to option 3?
Consensus: No.

Is option 15 similar to option 5?
Consensus: No.

Is option 15 similar to option 7?
Consensus: No.

Is option 15 similar to option 8?
Consensus: No.

Is option 15 similar to option 14?
Consensus: No.

Is option 16 similar to option 1?
Consensus: No.

Is option 16 similar to option 2?
Consensus: No.

Is option 16 similar to option 3?
Consensus: No.

Is option 16 similar to option 5?
Consensus: No.

Is option 16 similar to option 7?
Consensus: No.

Is option 16 similar to option 8?
Consensus: Yes.

Is option 17 similar to option 1?
- Both have the same objective - user access to stocks.

Consensus: Yes.

Is option 18 similar to option 1?
- Both are harvest management options... although the effects would be opposite.
- Disagree... one establishes a management concept - seasonal management - while the other might or might not involve seasonal management.
- In organizing the options field, these two would be at the same point on the x axis, but perhaps far apart on the y axis.

Consensus: No.

Is option 18 similar to option 2?
Consensus: No.

Is option 18 similar to option 3?
Consensus: No.

Is option 18 similar to option 5?
Consensus: No.

Is option 18 similar to option 7?
Consensus: No.

Is option 18 similar to option 8?
Consensus: No.

Is option 18 similar to option 14?
Consensus: Yes.

Is option 19 similar to option 1?
- Both are harvest management strategies.

Consensus: Yes.

Is option 20 similar to option 1?
Consensus: No.

Is option 20 similar to option 2?
Consensus: No.

Is option 20 similar to option 3?
Consensus: No.

Is option 20 similar to option 5?
Consensus: No.

Is option 20 similar to option 7?
- No, because option 20 seems intended to address allocation.
- Fishery management north of Cape Falcon is largely constrained by weak stocks, which is somewhat the intent of option 7.

Consensus: No.

Is option 20 similar to option 8?
Consensus: No.

Is option 20 similar to option 14?
- Yes. There is interim allocation north of Falcon.

Consensus: Yes.

Is option 21 similar to option 2?
Consensus: No.

Is option 21 similar to option 3?
Consensus: No.

Is option 21 similar to option 5?
Consensus: No.

Is option 21 similar to option 7?
Consensus: No.

Is option 21 similar to option 8?
Consensus: No.

Is option 21 similar to option 14?
- Yes. Both are allocation strategies.
- Disagree... 21 is a general-purpose process not necessarily tied to allocation.

Consensus: No.

Is option 21 similar to option 15?
- Both are ways to reduce disputes.
- No... they are related, but not similar.

Consensus: No.

Is option 22 similar to option 1?
Consensus: No.

Is option 22 similar to option 2?
Consensus: No.

Is option 22 similar to option 3?
- No. Share trading is a form of allocation, and we have, earlier, concluded there is no significant similarity between's Hayden's user cooperative option (#3) and other allocation options.

Consensus: No.

Is option 22 similar to option 7?
Consensus: No.

Is option 22 similar to option 8?
Consensus: No.

Is option 22 similar to option 14?
- No. Option 22 refers to trading part of your fish allocation, not to the allocation process.
- Yes. Both options have to do with what each harvester group ends up with.

Consensus: No.

Is option 22 similar to option 15?
Consensus: No.

Is option 22 similar to option 21?
Consensus: No.

Is option 23 similar to option 21?
Consensus: No.

Is option 23 similar to option 2?
Consensus: No.

Is option 23 similar to option 3?
Consensus: No.

Is option 23 similar to option 5?
Consensus: No.

Is option 23 similar to option 7?
Consensus: No.

Is option 23 similar to option 8?
Consensus: No.

Is option 23 similar to option 14?
- Yes. Both are allocation options.
- No. Allocation is not the same as selling one's allocation...they are different steps.

Consensus: No.

Is option 23 similar to option 15?
Consensus: No.

Is option 23 similar to option 21?
Consensus: No.

Is option 23 similar to option 22?
Consensus: Yes.

Adjourned for the day.

18 May Friday, 0800, reconvene.

Revised agenda:

0800	Convene, review agenda
0810	Finish building options field
0930	Sequence Design Categories
1030	Break
1045	Mark options field to sequence
1050	Criteria
1230	Group and room assignments, divide into 3 groups and develop alternatives.
1330	Presentations of 3 alternatives.
1415	Next step
1445	Discussion of next meeting
1500	Adjourn

Revised agenda approved.

Using the basis of structure developed by the computer yesterday, options 1 through 23 were put on placards and positioned on the board according to their initial similarities. These options were reviewed.

Finish building options field.

"Interactive Structuring" continued when the remaining options were positioned on the board in a location based on similarity to other options in the groups already on the board.

Two options were developed out of option 40:

32 (the new 32) will be "Manage all ocean fisheries consistent with KR natural production."
40 will be "Manage all ocean activities consistent with KR natural production."

The groups of options were named:

#1: Decision Making Process
#2: Harvest Management Strategies
#3: Resource Assessment & Monitoring
#4a: Organizational Approach
#4b: Communication
#5: Escapement Policy
#6: Habitat
#7: Allocation Strategies
#8: Enhancement
#9: Effort Management Strategies

Dave Mackett explained the next steps: We now have the categories, people can still add or subtract from these categories. Suggests that members get assistance from the technical team (and others) to further flesh out these options.

Dave will describe how to make the choices, then ISM process will be used. Recommended that decisions are not based on feasibility initially, this can be considered later, but it is better not to use this as a basis at the beginning.

Sequence Design Categories.

Sequencing of the option groups was decided by looking at each group and deciding which order it should come in compared to the other groups. This ordering was based on Trigger Question #3:

"In the context of designing a long-term strategy, should a choice of options in category X be made before (simultaneously with) choices from category Y?"

Decision points:

++ Should a choice of options from the group Harvest Management Strategies be made before the options from Resource Assessment and Monitoring?

(Marshall): The timing of the current strategy is not logical.

(Warrens): We need an assessment of what we have to work with before we can have a harvest management strategy.

(Hayden): Both categories need to be done continually.

(Mackett): Reminded the Council to stay away from getting bogged down by the steps of carrying out the options because right now we are working only on designing the strategy.

++ Should a choice of options from the group Harvest Management Strategies be made before the options from Organizational Approach?
Consensus: yes.

++ Should a choice of options from the group Organizational Approach be made before the options from Enhancement?

(Marshall): Feels that the current process (KFMC, PFMC, etc) is disjointed.

The new option 50 "maintain status quo" put in the Organizational approach category.

Consensus: Yes.

++ Enhancement before Escapement Policy?

(Martin): No, because escapement is at the core of the decision making tree, and should be first.

Consensus: No.

++ Escapement Policy before Organizational Approach?

Consensus: No.

++ Resource Assessment and Monitoring before Escapement?

(Marshall): This is the same strategy as the Ninth Amendment, the goal should be set first.

(Fullerton): This goal was set on how much the basin can handle.

(Martin): Assuming that we already understand the status quo, then Lyle's approach makes sense, Charlie is saying not to assume that we already know enough about the Klamath basin.

Dave recounted that strategies will be made in this afternoon's meeting. People will need to make decisions without the actual numbers available.

Consensus: Yes.

(Masten): Let's divide the column into "assessment" and "monitoring"

++ Organizational Approach before Escapement Policy?
Consensus: Yes.

++ Escapement before Enhancement?
Consensus: Yes.

++ Habitat before Organizational Approach?
Consensus: No.

++ Organizational Approach before Habitat?
Consensus: Yes.

++ Habitat before Escapement?

(Martin): We should first decide on managing for natural fish.

(Fullerton): If this decision comes after the FWS study on water needs, then do we decide escapement based on this amount of water ?

(Wilkinson): We don't know what the natural water situation is.

(Marshall): Does this mean that we will determine the escapement goal then plead for water?

Consensus: No.

++ Enhancement before Habitat?

(Bingham): No, because the major decisions about the amount of available habitat will be made, then the amount of enhancement will depend on this.

Consensus: No.

++ Escapement before Habitat?

(Bingham): Argues that habitat decisions need to be made first, then escapement based on the habitat decisions.

(Martin): Yes, because habitat measures protect habitat. Later, the other steps can be accomplished.

Consensus: Yes.

++ Habitat before Enhancement?

(Marshall): Shouldn't we decide on enhancement measures first, then decide on habitat?

(Odemar): Yes, habitat before enhancement is the method that the Bureau uses.

Consensus: Yes.

++ Allocation Strategies before Organizational Approach?
Consensus: No.

++ Escapement before Allocation Strategies?
Consensus: Yes.

++ Allocation before Habitat?
Consensus: No.

++ Enhancement before Allocation?
Consensus: No.

++ Allocation before Enhancement?
Consensus: Yes.

++ Communication before Organizational Approach?
Consensus: No.

++ Escapement before Communication?

(Martin): Organization, then decision, then communication. These should be done in a block, in order.

Consensus: No.

++ Communications before Enhancement?
Consensus: Yes.

++ Resource Assessment & Monitoring before Communication?
Consensus: No.

++ Resource Assessment & Monitoring before Habitat?
Consensus: Yes.

++ Decision Making Process before Communication?
Consensus: Yes.

++ Decision Making Process before Resource Assessment & Monitoring?
Consensus: Yes.

++ Decision Making Process before Harvest Management Strategies?
Consensus: Yes.

++ Effort Management Strategies before Decision Making Process?
Consensus: No.

++ Effort Management Strategies before Harvest Management Strategies?
Consensus: No.

++ Effort Management Strategies before Escapement Policy?
Consensus: No.

++ Habitat before Effort Management Strategies?
Consensus: Yes.

++ Effort Management Strategies before Allocation Strategies?

(Marshall): If Effort Management Strategies were implemented, would it make allocation easier?

(Mackett): Implementation doesn't matter right now, it will be worked on this afternoon.

Consensus: No.

++ Enhancement before Effort Management Strategies?

(Martin): No, because enhancement looks into the future, effort reduction is current.

(Marshall): Enhancement is a long term step that should be taken first.

(Fullerton): Enhancement should be first because it will help people who may be bought out make their decision.

(Bingham): Recounted that this has been a long-standing issue in California.

(Wilkinson): Enhancement is a money issue, it should come before extreme measures.

(Martin): If enhancement comes first, then it should also come before allocation, harvest management, effort reduction.

Consensus: Yes.

Review Options Field

(Mackett): Having sequenced the categories of options, we have completed the third objective of the meeting: producing a preliminary options field. A graphic (Attachment 4) illustrates the options field.

The next step will be developing criteria... but first, Mackett explained the meaning of "draft alternative designs". Alternatives are formed by examining the first category in sequence, choosing desired options, moving to the second category, choosing options, and so on. Mackett proposed that three teams could be formed from the Council to develop three alternatives.

The following step will be to select a best alternative by evaluating the alternatives against a set of criteria, to be developed before the alternatives are developed. Dave used the term "tradeoffs", referring to the weighing of how various alternatives meet various criteria, and negotiating toward consensus on a "best" alternative.

At this point, Option 51 was added to the Allocation Strategies category in the options field. This option, presented by Jim Martin, is to maintain status quo (1989-90) harvest shares (on percentage basis) among users until there is agreement of all parties to modify them, or seek new legal direction.

Clarification of Martin's Option 51:

Q: Do you refer to the allocation contained in the 5-year agreement as "status quo"?
A: No, I mean the actual shares of the past two years.

Sue Masten then proposed an Allocation Strategy option (#52 in Attachment 4) of .325/.525 ocean/inriver Klamath chinook harvest rates.

Development of Criteria for Evaluating System Designs

(Mackett): New trigger question (#4): "In the context of designing a harvest management system for the Klamath River basin, what criteria should be applied to help select the best alternative design from those developed and presented?"

Comments:

- o We need criteria that help us accomplish our goals.
  (Mackett): Agree...we could cross-check against our goals.
- o Disagree: purpose of criteria is to evaluate alternatives.
- o Alternative that comes closest to meeting our goals should be the best one.

Development of criteria, by ISM technique:

1. (Mackett): (Providing an example): Cost.

   Clarification: I mean the cost of all actions included in the alternative, including data collection, share buyout, whatever.

2. (Hayden): Number of species addressed.

   Clarification: I mean to say, we are required to plan for all anadromous species.

3. (Warrens): Preservation of genetic diversity.

   Clarification: About the same as Odemar's #6 below, so cross mine out.

4. (Martin): Achievable with current production, as opposed to requiring new production.

   Clarification: I mean we should look at each alternative in terms of the fish production actually achieved in recent years. If that level of production won't make the alternative work, rank it down.

5. (Reed): The degree to which the alternative meets users' needs.

   Clarification: Each user group has expressed to us the needs they wish to meet, so let's score alternatives on how close they come to meeting needs.

Q: Do you mean, let user groups order their needs from "minimum" on up to "fully viable", then grade alternatives on how many of the needs get met, how often? A: Yes.

Q: Our goals include viable ocean and river fisheries. Is that the kind of thing you would use for a criterion?
A: Would have to look at the individual goals.

6. (Odemar): Preserves and strengthens natural anadromous populations (taken from standards in the Klamath Act).

Clarification: I present this as a criterion because the language is in the Klamath Act, and is consistent with the State's anadromous fish goals.

Q: Define "natural".
A: Agree that is a major issue.

7. (Reed): Net economic benefits.

Clarification: See goal #17 about optimizing benefits to the public... that's what I am getting at.

Q: Do you mean benefits regardless of to whom they accrue?
A: Yes, but I don't intend for this criterion to work to anyone's disadvantage... just want us to include cost-effectiveness in our ranking of alternatives.

Q: What if the economic value of allocating fish to one group is greater than allocating to another?
(Martin): Feel we have to consider this even though it makes inriver users uncomfortable...believe the Magnuson Act requires us to consider aggregate costs of each alternative.

(Marshall): Agree with Martin.

(Warrens): The Magnuson Act precludes displacement of one user group by another on a cost basis.

(Fullerton): Don't believe we are bound by the Magnuson Act.

8. (Warrens): Recognition of social values.

Clarification: Yesterday we discussed intangible benefits that can't be measured in dollars.

Q: How would you distinguish social from economic?
A: Things that can't be valued monetarily I consider social values.

Q: Do you intend that we would rank alternatives in terms of the number of social values they would meet, or promote?

A: The Magnuson Act combines social and economic values, but the Klamath Council seems to prefer to treat them separately.

Q: Do you foresee a yes/no criterion...alternative x does or does not meet social need y? A: Something like that.

(Martin): Suggest a modification of Frank's criterion: Something like: meets minimum needs of keeping each user group in business... so they don't dry up.

9. (Reed): Degree of public acceptability.

Q: Isn't this covered by meeting user needs?
A: No, I refer to communication with the public... see goal 32. I foresee a scale of 1 to 10 gauging how well an alternative meets public acceptance.

10. (Bingham): Users' flexibility.

Clarification: Some options give more flex than others in terms of harvesting strategies. Let's use this as one criterion.

11. (Martin): Achievable under the current governmental structure, as opposed to requiring something new.

Clarification: I refer to favoring alternatives that can be implemented now, while giving lower rank to those that require new laws.

(Fullerton): I suggest using the standards of the Klamath Act as criteria.

12. (Masten): Meets standards of the Klamath Act... the things it requires of the Klamath Council.

Clarification: Some of the options we have considered are outside our purview.

Q: How would this criterion be applied?
A: An example of options that fit and do not fit within the authority given the Klamath Council: We are to allocate among users, but we are not to say how those allocations should be used.

(Mackett): How about a criterion for manageability... ease of management?

13. (Martin): Preserves all users.

Clarification: Relates to criterion #8. I refer to preserving primary social values such as historical uses, ceremonial/subsistence needs.

(Mackett): Now let's mark down, on cards, our first, second, and third choices of criteria. These will be awarded 5, 3, and 1 points.

While waiting for computer output from latest update, conducted new business.

New Business

(Odemar): Several points of interest:

- o You may have heard that our port samplers were recently called off the job because of budget constraints. They are now back on the job.

- o Chinook we had planned to hold to yearling size at Trinity and Iron Gate Hatcheries will be released as smolts. We can't afford to continue rearing them.

- o It appears the fishery agencies have settled on a request of 186,000 acre-feet of Trinity River flows. Lewiston will release 600 cfs until June 6 to move Trinity Hatchery fish out... to be released in the dark of the moon May 21.

(Tuss): Flows provided by the Bureau of Reclamation may be less than 186,000 af.

(Martin): Any response from Interior to the barrage of letters on Trinity flows? (Reed): Just an acknowledgement, since the issue is still under consideration. I'm having trouble understanding the rationale for the two flow rate options FWS provided (FWS letter of 5/10/90, Attachment 5). (Odemar): Objectives of the proposed flow schedule were: get juveniles out; get adults up (need 300 cfs in fall), and control summer water temperature. (Reed): Still wonder why the two options are shaped so differently.

(Reed): Seems like the Bureau of Reclamation should get some credit for flexibility in responding to flow requests from FWS. (Odemar): Agree, but we still don't have final agreement, and could get less than 186,000 af. (Martin): We deserve a written response from Interior, given that we are Secretary Lujan's advisors.

(Odemar): One last issue: We won't get Anadromous Grants funding ($85,000) we expected from FWS in FY1991. This would have paid for weir operations, and tagging of pond chinook. CDFG will try to operate weirs from other funds sources, and will get pond fish tagged (only four ponds operating this year... have had six in most years).

(Martin): We will also lose Anadromous Grants funding ($150,000)... will try to shift to Wallop-Breaux funds. I am also concerned about a cut in Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) funding of Arcata Fisheries Assistance Office operation ...would like an explanation. (Del Robinson): This has been discussed, but I don't think it will happen. (Martin): Would a letter from us help get the funding? (Robinson): Couldn't hurt.

(Martin): I move we write the BIA Area Director to urge funding of Arcata FAO harvest monitoring work at the level originally planned for this year.

Discussion:

Q: At what level would a decision be made on this?
A: (Robinson): Sacramento Area Director.

Masten: Yurok Transition Team has written BIA expressing concern.

Martin's motion is adopted by consensus. Martin is to draft the letter, Klamath Field Office to send it. The letter was sent May 22 (Attachment 6).
****

(Odemar): Other impacts of our fiscal problems could include reduced staff support for KFMC and PFMC.

Proposed management plan for fall chinook net fishery

(Reed): Here is the preliminary BIA plan for managing the fall chinook net fishery on the Yurok Reservation this year (Attachment 7). Features include a closure around Labor Day. The spring chinook net fishery is underway, but catches are poor.

Discussion:

(Bostwick): This differs from what Karol Overberg showed me yesterday.

(Odemar): Appears you have dropped the idea of requiring small net mesh. How does this affect the gain of 1500 harvestable fish deriving from reduced vulnerability of 4-year-old chinook?
(Tuss): The main causal factor in shifting net harvest from 4s to 3s is delayed timing of the net fishery. Mesh size would be a minor factor. We decided not to introduce a mesh size requirement because of the expense of buying new nets.

(Martin): How does the Yurok net harvest target - 19,600 - relate to the chinook escapement target?
(Tuss): It is consistent with the escapement goal. The Tech Team is considering the argument that the later commercial net fishery proposed this year will catch relatively more 3s. Vulnerability rate of 3s was modeled at .57 for 1990, compared to previous value of .67. If the Tech Team agrees to revise the vulnerability rate upward to reflect the changed structure of the fishery, the bonus fish - 1500 or so as shown in Attachment 7 - could be added to the commercial fishery target, increasing it to 20-21,000.

(Tuss): We request the Council to send the proposal (Attachment 7) to the Tech Team for analysis.

Discussion:

Q: What is 25 CFR Part 250?
(Robinson): Regulations on management of Hoopa fisheries.

(Fullerton): Council, do you endorse this fishery management plan?

(Martin): Move we:

- o Concur in setback of commercial fishery into September to save 4-year-olds
- o Endorse the inclusion of at least a limited commercial fishery in the plan
- o Ask our Tech Team to assess impacts of the plan on harvest of 3s and 4s.

Seconded by Bingham.

Discussion of motion:

(Bostwick): Dates identified in Attachment 7 may change some.

Q: Would the Council take some action based on the Tech Team analysis? (Martin): No. If Team analysis indicates the BIA plan won't meet the escapement target, we would expect BIA to alter the plan without further comment from the Council.

Martin's motion passed by consensus, with Marshall abstaining.
****

(Odemar): CDFG will draw up a memorandum of agreement with BIA for management of the 1990 river fisheries, based on the BIA plan.

Endangered Species Act review.

(Fullerton): The State of California and National Marine Fisheries Service have been asked to review the status of summer steelhead and spring chinook salmon in the South Fork Trinity for possible listing under State and/or Federal endangered species laws. NMFS will probably look at status of these stocks throughout the Trinity basin, rather than just in the South Fork.

(Martin): The Northwest Region of NMFS has received a petition from the Shoshone-Bannock Tribe of Idaho to list Snake River sockeye. That stock was extinct for 31 years, then reestablished from kokanee. The 1989 run was two fish. A petition is expected, from the conservation group Oregon Trout, to consider Snake River chinook stocks and lower Columbia coho stocks for listing. Senator Hatfield has asked the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) to assess biological data before the issue becomes highly political, like the spotted owl. Several agencies are working on a report for Hatfield (subscript: report made available June 4). There is great potential here for impacts on ocean and river fisheries: lower river natural stocks of coho are mixed with many hatchery coho, and Snake River chinook are mixed with upriver bright chinook spawning in the Hanford Reach of the Columbia. The latter stock supports a tribal gillnet fishery. Look out for many different groups bringing forward the fish stocks of special concern to them for protection.

(Odemar): More on South Fork Trinity stocks: California Fish and Game Commission meets today, will hear reports on the status of spring chinook statewide (postscript: Commission did not get to this agenda item). Highlights: Only four self-sustaining runs remain in California: Mill and Deer Creeks in the upper Sacramento drainage, Salmon River, and South Fork Trinity. Mel thought the Commission will make spring chinook a candidate species for State listing...not sure about summer steelhead. This would probably result in sport fishing restrictions. A Federal listing of spring chinook would have serious impacts.

Further New Business

(Wilkinson): Asks Craig Tuss to review the draft agenda for the ocean/estuary symposium (Attachment 8).

(Tuss): The symposium was suggested by Lisle Reed, as a way to bring together information on the year-to-year variations in ocean growth and survival which contribute so much to the imprecision in our stock size forecasts. The symposium is scheduled for September 22, tied to the chinook and coho symposium sponsored by the American Fisheries Society. Six speakers have been identified... need one more... request the Klamath Council identify a person to take on that task.

(Martin): Suggest Pete Lawson of ODFW to address factors affecting movement and mortality of chinook stocks. He has information that Sacramento stocks become vulnerable to harvest at different latitudes in different years.

(Odemar): Suggest the NMFS group at Monterey - Dick Parrish - to address effect of ocean conditions on productivity.

(Tuss): Have been in touch with both groups. With this guidance, I will request Lawson or Parrish to serve as speaker.

****

Discussion of next meeting.

Discussion included the following comments:

- Understand we are to take alternatives to our constituents before we meet again.
- Given there is no other pressing Council business until fall, let's not delay the next meeting too long, and finish drafting the plan at that meeting.
- (Mackett): I am concerned the Tech Team is not here... you need staff work on technical points. (Fullerton): Dave, can you work directly with the Tech Team? (Mackett): Hard to bring them up to speed when they have missed all this discussion.
- Which issues need to go to the Tech Team, or what should they contribute? (Mackett): We need them to flesh out the options field, and to help develop alternatives. Our work today in developing

alternatives will be practice only. They should also participate in rating alternatives against criteria, in tradeoff negotiations to arrive at a best alternative, and in documenting the rationale for what has been decided. We will need about 2 1/2 days for this.

Dates suggested:

16-18 September.

17-18 September, with a night session on 17 September.

(Hayden): Has a conflict on 17 September.

13-14 September.

More travel expense, for most people, than 9/17-18, since many will go on to PFMC in Monterey on 9/19.

(Fullerton): Decision to meet 17-18 September, in La Jolla.

****

SUBSCRIPT: DATE OF NEXT MEETING SUBSEQUENTLY CHANGED....

NEXT MEETING WILL BE HELD OCTOBER 2-3, 1990 IN LA JOLLA.

****

Adjourn for lunch

Criteria Ranking (as decided by council members).

RANK	CRITERIA
1	5
2	6,7
3	
4	1,12
5	
6	8
7	11
8	9
9	10

(Masten): #6 is part of #12.

The preliminary options field that is now structured was distributed to council members (Attachment 4).

The Council was divided into 3 groups to have a practice run at developing possible alternatives.

Developing Alternatives

When the groups return, a spokesperson from each group will give a report to the council.

The groups worked on this for 45 minutes.

When the groups returned, Dave Mackett asked for each spokesperson to relate a few experiences that their group encountered.

Mel reported as the spokesperson from the "Black" Group.

Option 1 and Option 44 -- Lyle Marshall felt that Option 44 was debatable because the process would still start with a number, then the season would be based around that.

Resource Assessment & Monitoring -- chose Options 2, 4 and 48.

Organizational Approach -- Option 50.

Communication -- Options 15, and 26, added word "improve".

Escapement Policy -- Option 42. (Option 49 is being considered as an option for Amendment 10).

Habitat -- Option 8, some discussion on optimal or minimal, stayed w/optimal; Option 9.

Allocation Strategies -- Options 51 and 52.

Enhancement -- Options 5 and 47. Change wording on Option 5 to refer to artificial production not hatcheries.

Effort Management Strategies -- Option 31.

Mel reported that many compromises were made within the group.

Jim Martin was the spokesperson from the "Blue" group.

Decision Making Process: added an option to require negative votes of 2 council members for a veto.

Harvest Management Strategies: Option 1, (if technically feasible and agreed upon), Option 17.

Resource Assessment and Monitoring: Options 2, 4, 12, 27, and 48. Liked Option 27 but uncomfortable with Option 33 (even though 33 started to go in the right direction).

Organizational Approach: Option 50.

Communication: Options 15, and 26. Write in "improve public awareness through flyers and newsletters" and "vary locations of meetings".

Escapement Policy: Options 7, and 25. No consensus on anything else.

Habitat: Options 8, and 9 (when it is reworded use "recommend" instead of "mandate by law").

Allocation Strategies: had to skip because of time.

Enhancement: had to skip because of time.

Effort Management Strategies: Option 31.

Virginia Bostwick served as the spokesperson for the "Green" team.

Decision Making Process: could not agree.

Harvest Management Strategies: Options 17, 19, and 35.

Resource Assessment & Monitoring: everything except Option 10. (Options 2,4,12,13,24,27,33, and 48).

Organizational Approach: Option 50.

Communication: Option 15, and 26 (Bostwick): Agrees with the wording changes proposed by the "Blue" group (see above).

Escapement Policy: Options 7, 32, 37, and 39.

Habitat: Options 8, 9, 16, 40 (add words "harvest management plans").

Allocation Strategies: Options 18, 51, 52.

Enhancement: Options 5 and 47.

Effort Management Strategies: Option 22.

Dave Mackett asked members to characterize this process:

Roundtable comments:

(Warrens): The major debate deals with this groups inability to make decisions based on current consensus process. It is good to see another group feels that option 30 was important.

(Marshall): Overall this was a good discussion. Regarding option 26, felt that group processes can break down when interrupted at meetings. Suggests that the public should write comments on paper to give to representatives, instead of interrupting the meetings with caucuses.

(Fullerton): Didn't feel that these interruptions were happening. Let him know if interruptions occur.

(Odemar): We kept our groups decisions very narrow and left the assessment to just the information needed for allocation and harvest rate management.

(Fullerton): If we are planning, we should not consider what is going on now, we should consider what we want to happen.

(Martin): Our group threw out the extremes. We need more discussion for what our group wants to move toward. Overall there was a spirit of compromise, and he felt that the opinions expressed were closer to consensus than he expected considering the makeup of groups.

(Bostwick): We agreed on pertinent factors, without considering costs. Agrees with the changes made under Decision Making (Option 30).

(Wilkinson): Overall there was a tone of group discussion, including voluntary compromises.

(Masten): Agrees with Jim's comments.

(Fullerton): Our group included things that may later be funneled out, but went ahead and included them now to make sure that they went through the process.

(Hayden): Our group continually reassessed what the options meant.

(Reed): Felt surprised that the individual personalities in the group were different from the ones he saw in the large meeting setting. Doesn't feel that we are as divergent as some of these arrows may now show. Overall feels that everyone is tracking fairly close together, some people in the group made compromises that they were not comfortable with in order for group processes to carry on.

(Bingham): Learned that we can sit down as a group and work together, very encouraged by today's decisions. If we did it "quick and dirty" today, we can get there again...

(Mackett): Asked how people felt about the options in general. Do you need to flesh them out? Take them to constituents for review?

(Bingham): Yes, definitely will take them to constituents for review.

(Reed): These options need work, some could be condensed into a statement that is more explanatory. Then they could be taken to constituents.

(Hayden): These options need work. They are currently too narrow. Here we are focusing on fall chinook but we need to put more emphasis on other species as well.

(Fullerton): These options will cover a tremendous amount of ground when fleshed out. We need to take them to constituents, but I'd hate to see 60 more options develop as a result of this action. Regarding species - we have centered our discussions on fall chinook because that is the controversial species.

(Masten): It will be a difficult task getting the general public to understand what is being talked about and developed at these meetings (example, "MSY"). Concerned about how to get this to the people in a timely manner.

(Wilkinson): Understand's Sue's concerns. Interested in further pursuit of the similarities that were arising within the groups.

(Bostwick): Concerned about people understanding these options as listed. Hopefully the discussion in the minutes of the meeting will clarify them.

(Martin): Pleased with today's process. Felt that it is too bad that we have to leave today and can't continue with this productive-let's-work-together attitude.

(Odemar): Shares concerns with how this might be seen and interpreted by the public. Sees a potential problem with letting this discussion go out to the public in its present form because of the potential confusion that may result from the public not understanding that it is in the initial planning stages. For the options, Mel feels that he needs more time, and will have to review them again. Today the discussion was friendly, soon the feelings may not be so nice.

(Marshall): We eliminated a lot of options that were dead wood, there were others that we tended to agree on, and yet others that may be able to be deleted. Overall these options are shaping up.

(Warrens): Our group tended to include options when in doubt. The future success of the council will depend on people setting aside past attitudes and finding middle ground. This will be critical.

(Fullerton): A small amount of "word smithing" will make more options available. Agrees with Mel that not many people will understand this discussion in its present form as a "planning step".

(Bingham): First reassured council that he will not be distributing the proceedings of this meeting to trollers indiscriminately... will be sitting down and working with them in small groups, and explaining the context of the options.

(Hayden): Thinks that the council is in real trouble because even though we have good intentions, it doesn't always correspond with what happens. For example, even though we had a public comment period, the person who came here to comment wasn't able to because of the agenda change.

Dave Mackett called for the next steps that people want to see happen.

Roundtable generation of comments:

(Reed): Feels that he doesn't need to worry about a constituency. Maybe the technical team needs to fill in the criteria on options, the rest of us who have constituencies need to do it in the manner that Nat suggested (see above).

(Hayden): Expressed disgust with being "run over" on meeting date decision.

(Fullerton): We need another meeting to complete this process, agrees with Jim that its too bad that we need to break this productive meeting off now.

(Masten): Assign the technical team to combine options that need to be combined. The next meeting is scheduled for September [now October] which will allow her enough time to be able to reach out to her constituents.

(Fullerton): Suggested that the tech team should be brought up to date on the process so far, then make their decisions.

(Wilkinson): Doesn't agree with any comments so far, suggests using small groups of council members, then arbitrating. Need to clean this up so that it is meaningful to go out, then send it out.

(Bostwick): Feels that Charlie and Keith's ideas are good.

(Martin): Agrees that we should not send this out indiscriminately, wait until its clearer first to prevent "fires" from starting from something that is not yet completed.

(Odemar): Recommended (along with Charlie) for a subgroup of council and tech team to meet.

(Marshall): Let's consider paring down the options. Some of us feel that we have an agreement, some of us don't.

(Fullerton): We have a harvest allocation agreement, but we don't have a long-term plan as required by the law.

(Marshall): Disagrees.

(Warrens): Feels that this process is good. Agrees with Keith and Sue.

Charlie Fullerton re-affirmed that this meeting location (NMFS office, La Jolla, CA) was decided on by this council for a purpose, primarily for the availability of the skills of Dave Mackett and the special planning computers.

Meeting adjourned.

ATTACHMENT 1

KLAMATH FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

Attendance Roster, May 17-18, 1990 meeting in La Jolla, Ca.

Management Council Members

Nat Bingham	California Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry
Virginia Bostwick	Klamath In-River Sport Fishery
E. C. Fullerton(Chair)	National Marine Fisheries Service
Robert Hayden	California Ocean Sport Fishery
C.L. Marshall	Hoopa Valley Business Council
James Martin	Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife
Susan Masten	Non-Hoopa Indians Residing in Klamath Area
Mel Odemar for A.E. Naylor	California Department of Fish & Game
J. Lisle Reed	U.S. Department of the Interior
Frank Warrens	Pacific Fishery Management Council
Keith Wilkinson	Oregon Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry

Others Attending

Harleigh Calame	USFWS
Ron Iverson	USFWS
Ronnie Pierce	Yurok Transition Team
Del Robinson	Bureau of Indian Affairs
Craig Tuss	USFWS
Jim Walters	Self
Tricia Whitehouse	USFWS

DRAFT AGENDA
KLAMATH FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
MAY 17-18, 1990
SOUTHWEST FISHERIES CENTER
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA

17 MAY

0900	Convene. Review and approval of agenda, and of minutes of previous meeting -- Council.
0930	Review of planning system and previous planning results -- Mackett/Council.
1000	Review of Goals -- Mackett/Council.
1100	Generation and clarification of Options for Meeting the Goals (Design Options) -- Council.
1230	Lunch
1330	Continue clarification of Options -- Council.
1430	Structure Options into an Options Field -- Council.
1730	Adjourn

18 MAY

0800	Review Options Field -- Council.
0845	Development of Criteria for Evaluating System Designs -- Council.
0930	Development of Draft Alternative Designs using the Options Field -- Council.
1130	Public comment.
1145	New business -- Council.
Noon	Lunch
1300	Presentation and discussion of Alternative Designs -- Council.
1500	Next steps in planning -- Mackett/Council.
1530	Discussion of next meeting -- Council.
1545	Adjourn.

PRELIMINARY OPTIONS FIELD FOR DESIGNING A LONG-TERM STRATEGY FOR MEETING KFMC GOALS

1. DECISION MAKING PROCESS

- 21. MANDATE MANAGEMENT DISPUTE RESOLUTION BY A MEDIATION/ ARBITRATION PROCESS
- 30. AMEND KFMC DECISION PROCESS TO DECIDE BY 2/3 MAJORITY
- STATUS QUO
- ~~STATUS~~ 2 DISSENTS TO VETO

2. HARVEST MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES

- 1. COORDINATED SEASONAL MANAGEMENT: TIME, AREA, NOT QUOTA
- 11. FINE-TUNE ALLOCATIONS BY ALLOWING IN-RIVER FISHING IN ALL SALMON SPAWNING RIVERS
- 17. DEVELOP REGULATIONS THAT ALLOW USERS ACCESS TO THE STOCKS
- 19. DIRECT ALL RIVER HARVEST TO HATCHERIES STOCKS ONLY
- 34. DEVELOP A TERMINAL FISHERY
- 35. EXPAND BOUNDARIES OF THE KMZ
- 44. OPEN ALL COMMERCIAL FISHING TO FULL SEASONAL MANAGEMENT

3. RESOURCE ASSESSMENT & MONITORING

- 2. DEVISE A MONITORING PROGRAM THAT ENABLES INSTANTANEOUS ESTIMATION OF HARVEST STATUS OF ALL SALMON STOCKS
- 4. SEEK FUNDS FOR IMPROVED IN-SEASON DATA COLLECTION
- 10. MARK ALL KLAMATH FISH
- 12. DETERMINE POTENTIAL PRODUCTION OF EACH SPECIES IN THE BASIN
- 13. DETERMINE VARIOUS POTENTIAL MIXES
- 24. DEVELOP A METHOD TO IMMEDIATELY IDENTIFY HATCHERY FISH
- 27. IMPROVE HARVESTABILITY OF HATCHERY FISH BY ALTERING STOCKS, RELEASE LOCATIONS, AND BY FIN CLIPPING
- 33. DEVELOP NEW SORTING AND HARVEST METHODS
- 48. INSTITUTE A COASTWIDE GSI OCEAN LANDING SAMPLING PROGRAM TO DETERMINE STOCK COMPOSITION OF OCEAN LANDINGS

TIE LINE

MAY 18,1990

ATTACHMENT 4

PRELIMINARY OPTIONS FIELD FOR DESIGNING A LONG-TERM STRATEGY FOR MEETING KFMC GOALS

4a. ORGANIZATIONAL APPROACH

- 3. FORM A KLAMATH RIVER PRODUCERS' COOPERATIVE
- 50. MAINTAIN STATUS QUO ORGANIZATION

4b. COMMUNICATION

- 15. INCREASE TIMELY COMMUNICATION ON AGENCY MANAGEMENT PRACTICES
- 26. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT IN PROBLEM-SOLVING STRATEGIES

enhance improve P. O. waters thru thru flyers, newsletters

Vary locations of KFMC

5. ESCAPEMENT POLICY

- 7. MANAGE ESCAPEMENT TO PRODUCE MSY FOR EACH KR RUN WHILE PREVENTING EXTINCTION OF ANY KR TRIBUTARY WILD SUB-POPULATION
- 25. DEVELOP MSY THROUGH HARVEST RATE MANAGEMENT
- 32. MANAGE ALL OCEAN FISHERIES CONSISTENT WITH KR NATURAL PRODUCTION
- 37. MANAGE ALL OCEAN SALMON FISHERIES CONSISTENT WITH NATURAL PRODUCTIVITY
- 39. MANAGE ALL KR SALMON FISHERIES CONSISTENT WITH NATURAL PRODUCTIVITY
- 42. ESTABLISH A THRESHOLD FOR NATURAL STOCK PRODUCTIVITY BELOW WHICH WE WILL RE-EXAMINE THE GOALS OF MANAGING FOR NATURAL FISH
- 49. AMEND ESCAPEMENT GOAL RATE TO INCLUDE A CEILING

TIE LINE

MAY 18, 1990

PRELIMINARY OPTIONS FIELD FOR DESIGNING A LONG-TERM STRATEGY FOR MEETING KFMC GOALS

didn't get to 7 or 8

6. HABITAT

- 8. REQUIRE WATER FLOWS ADEQUATE TO ACHIEVE OPTIMAL PRODUCTIVITY OF THE BASIN (Recommend)
- 9. MANDATE BY LAW MINIMUM HABITAT STANDARDS
- 16. IMPLEMENT MINIMUM STREAM-FLOW STANDARDS
- 40. MANAGE ALL OCEAN ACTIVITIES CONSISTENT WITH KR(NATURAL PRODUCTION) (Management Plan) Harvest

7. ALLOCATION STRATEGIES

- 14. MAKE 4 INTERIM AND 1 LONG-TERM ALLOCATION
- 18. ESTABLISH A TWO-TIERED ALLOCATION SYSTEM: 1) ABSOLUTE MINIMUM NEEDS FOR EACH USER GROUP; 2) ALLOCATE BETWEEN USER GROUPS TO OPTIMIZE THE TOTAL ECONOMICS OF KB
- 20. SIMPLIFY THE PROCESS BY MANAGING THE KR FISHERY SAME AS CO-MANAGED FISHERIES NORTH OF CAPE FALCON
- 28. INSTITUTE AN ITQ SYSTEM FOR KMZ TROLL SALMON
- 36. USE ITQS OF WILD KLAMATH FALL CHINOOK EQUIVALENTS TO MANAGE ALL FISHERIES (IN-RIVER AND OCEAN)
- 38. REGULATE EFFORT SHIFTS TO RESERVE KMZ ALLOCATION FOR LOCAL FISHERMEN
- 41. ESTABLISH A 50% SPLIT BETWEEN INDIAN AND NON-INDIAN HARVESTABLE FISH
- 43. ESTABLISH .50 OCEAN HARVEST RATE

51.

- STATUS QUO (89/90) PERCENT SHARES AMONG ALL USERS UNTIL AGREEMENT OF ALL PARTIES TO MODIFY OR NEW LEGAL DIRECTION OCCURS

52 STATUS QUO

5 YR AGREEMENT

.325/.525

8. ENHANCEMENT

- 5. PROPOSAL FOR ADDITIONAL HATCHERIES IN KLAMATH RIVER BASIN
- 6. PRODUCTION OF MORE FISH, I.E., TARGET ON HATCHERIES STOCK WHILE STRENGTHENING NATURAL STOCKS
- 47. RECOMMEND TO THE KB TASK FORCE HABITAT AND/OR BIO- ENHANCEMENT MEASURES FOR BASIN STOCKS FOUND BY KFMC TO BE WEAK RELATIVE TO GENERAL BASIN PRODUCTIVITY

TIE LINE

PRELIMINARY OPTIONS FIELD FOR DESIGNING A LONG-TERM STRATEGY FOR MEETING KFMC GOALS

9. EFFORT MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES

- 22. SHARE TRADING SYSTEM
- 23. BUY OUT OR TRADE OUT INDIAN COMMERCIAL FISHERIES
- 29. BUY OUT OR TRADE OUT KMZ TROLL AND SPORT FISHING
- 31. BUY OUT OR TRADE OUT TROLLERS
- 45. CLOSE ALL COMMERCIAL FISHING FOR 4 YEARS
- 46. CLOSE ALL FISHING FOR 4 YEARS

△ Wennens / Bostwick / Hayden / Fullerton

• Odemar / Wilkinson / Marshall

⊙ Bingham / Masten / Reed / Martin

TIE LINE

MAY 18,19

ATTACHMENT 5

United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Fish and Wildlife Enhancement
Sacramento Field Office
2800 Cottage Way, Rm. E-1803
Sacramento, California 95825

Hand delivered to Don Pratt (BR-CVOCO) 5-11-90 3:15pm

May 10, 1990

MEMORANDUM

TO : Regional Director, Mid-Pacific Region, Bureau of Reclamation, Sacramento, CA (Attn: MP-2800)

FROM : Field Supervisor, Fish and Wildlife Service, Fish and Wildlife Enhancement, Sacramento, CA

SUBJECT: Trinity River Flows - April 1, 1990 through March 31, 1991.

A minimum fishery flow schedule for the period April 1, 1990 through March 31, 1991 is being provided in Table 1. This schedule is based on the Bureau's evaluation of the probable inflow to Shasta Reservoir which classifies water year 1990 as critically-dry. It amounts to a Trinity River fishery release of 142,875 acre-feet.

TABLE 1. Trinity River "minimum" critical dry year fishery flow schedule.

Dates	No. Days	Flow(cfs)	Acre-Feet
April 1 - May 14	44	300	26,176
May 15 - May 20	6	150	1,785
May 21 - May 30	10	300	5,949
May 31 - Sept. 14	107	150	31,827
Sept. 15 - Sept. 30	16	200	6,346
Oct. 1 - Oct. 15	15	250	7,436
Oct. 16 - Nov. 30	46	300	27,365
Dec. 1 - March 31	121	150	35,991
TOTAL	365		142,875

The schedule in Table 1 provides minimal flows for fall spawning, smolt migration, and juvenile rearing. As mentioned previously, except in extreme emergency conditions we recommend that Trinity River releases be maintained at or above a minimum of 300 cfs at all times for fishery purposes.

To reduce the impacts of the extreme drought conditions currently facing the Trinity River fishery, and to preserve recent improved population levels we are recommending an augmentation of the "minimum" critical dry year fishery flow schedule provided in Table 1. This "augmented" schedule is given in Table 2 and provides more suitable flows for: 1) fall spawning needs; 2) spring migration; and, 3) summer temperature control. However, these flows still do not meet the minimum needed to sustain the Trinity River fishery.

TABLE 2. Trinity River "augmented" critical dry year fishery flow schedule.

Dates	No. Days	Flow(cfs)	Acre-Feet
April 1 - May 14	44	300	26,176
May 15 - June 5	22	600	26,176
June 6 - June 30	25	150	7,436
July 1 - Nov. 30	153	300[1]	91,120
Dec. 1 - March 31	121	150	35,991
TOTAL	365		186,899

[1] The full 300 cfs during July and August may not be required if high water temperatures or other stresses do not materialize. Water temperatures and spring behavior will be monitored by the Service.

These schedules have been coordinated with the California Department of Fish and Game, Trinity River Restoration Field Office, and Hoopa Valley Tribe.

Please let us know as soon as possible if the augmented critical dry year schedule recommended (i.e., Table 2) can be implemented on the Trinity River this year. Thank you.

James D. Carson

for Wayne S. White
Field Supervisor

cc: ARD, FWS(FWE), Portland, OR
ARD, FWS(FR), Portland, OR
Project Coordinator, Trinity River Restoration Program, Weaverville, CA
FWS(FWE), Lawiston Suboffice, Lewiston, CA
Director, California Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, CA
Mr. Steve Suagee, Hoopa Valley Tribe, Hoopa, CA
Mr. Howard Myrick, Chairman, Trinity River Technical Coordinating Committee, P.O. Box 1258, Weaverville, CA 96093-1258
Chairman, Board of Supervisors, Trinity County, P.O. Box 1258, Weaverville, CA 96093-1258

ATTACHMENT 6

Klamath Fishery Management Council

Working to Restore Anadromous Fish in the Klamath River Basin

P.O. Box 1006, Yreka, California 96097

May 22, 1990

alifornia Commercial Salmon shing Industry

alifornia Department of sh and Game

alifornia Offshore Sport Fishery

oopa Valley Business Council

lamath In-River Sport Fishery

ational Marine Fisheries Service

on-Hoopa Indian Representative

regon Commercial Salmon shing Industry

regon Department of sh and Wildlife

ery Management

S. Department of the Interior

Bureau of Indian Affairs
Ronald M. Jaegar
Area Director
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

Dear Mr. Jaegar,

The Klamath Fishery Management Council would like to express concern regarding reports of budget cuts for the BIA supported U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service work on the lower Klamath River in 1990. We are counting on the work being done and failure to support the Service's work on the lower Klamath River will seriously impact our management programs.

We understand that efforts are underway in your office to find the needed funds from another program. We understand the difficulty of this effort but hope you will be able to put the Klamath work at a very high priority. We are depending on the availability of updated, accurate data on Klamath River runs, catches and escapements in order to accomplish management objectives.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

EC Fullerton

Charlie Fullerton, Chairman

Proposed Fall Chinook Season For Management Area 1- 1990

	July 15	July 31	August 31	September 4	September* 7	October 10
SUBSISTENCE	CLOSED	9000 7:00 PM – 7:00 AM 5 days/week tues/sat	CLOSED		1000	reverts to 25 CFR, Part 250
COMMERCIAL	CLOSED	CLOSED	CLOSED	**	3000 + (1500?)	

* if post-labor day closure catches indicate a possibility that remaining quotas will not be taken, the fishing will change to 7 days/week, 24 hours/day

** incidental catches of coho taken in this period may be sold

OVER-ALL DISTRIBUTION FOR YUROK RESERVATION

AREA	SUB.	COMM.
I	10,000	3000 – 4500
II	6,600	– 0 –

19,600

Area II is managed under general regulations contained in 25 CFR, Part 250 but under an overall quota of 6600 adults.

ATTACHMENT 7

from Tuss
5/13/90

ATTACHMENT 8

Results of the SALMON 1990 COMMITTE MEETING MAY 2, 1990

Agenda as of May 2, 1990

Title: 1990 Northeast Pacific Chinook and Coho Salmon Symposium

Place: Humboldt State University, Van Duzer Theatre, Arcata, CA

Time: September 19 to September 21, 1990 (8:30am Wednesday to noon Friday)

Attendance: Unlimited

Sessions: 1 to 3 hour/sessions; 30 minutes/speaker, which included 10 minutes for questions

Hosts: Humboldt and Cal-Neva AFS Chapters

Contributors: Humboldt State University Fishery Department
USF&WL Cooperative Fishery Unit
Six Rivers National Forest
California Department of Fish & Game

AGENDA

September 18th optional FIELD TRIP: Field trip to Six Rivers National Forest to view streamside chinook salmon spawning and rearing facility, and instream structures constructed for providing chinook salmon spawning and rearing. Leave Arcata 10:00 A.M. and Return between 4 to 5:00 P.M. Must pre-register so that vehicles and lunches can be arranged. Will require field wading gear. Cost is $15.00. Contact Mary Kay Buck 916-629-2118 or Annelise Carleton 707-442-1721--Six Rivers N.F.

September 19th 8:30am to 5:00pm

8:30--9:00 Introduction, etc. Overton/Loudermilk
HSU President/N.R. Dean

9:00--12:00 Salmon Fisheries Management Overview of Major Drainages. Session moderator, Pat Higgins.

-Yukon Systems--Gene Sandone, Alaska Fish and Game Anchorage.

-Columbia System--Fred Olney, USF&WL, Vancouver,WA.

-Sacramento System--Forest Reynolds, CA Dept. of Fish and Game, Sacramento.

-Georgia Straits--Paul Starr/Brian Riddle; Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, Nanaimo, B.C.

1:00--5:00 Klamath River Salmon Management
Session Chairman, Jerry Barnes

-Harvest Models--Dave Hankin, Humboldt State Univer.

-Robert Kope, Nat. Mar. Fish. Ser.
Tiburon, CA.

-Ocean Harvest Models--Al Boracco, CA Dept. of Fish & Game, Sacramento.

-Cultural & Economic Concerns
Panel: Nat Bingam, Sue Madsen, Jim Smith.
(Commercial and Sport Fishermen,Local Governments)

September 19th 7:00 to 9:00 P.M.--Coho Management--HSU Corner Deli

Coho Salmon Management and Research: An informal get together of biologists involved in the management and research of Coho Salmon with concurrent social.

September 20th 8:00am to 5:00pm --Bill Loudermilk Cal-Neva Chapter to arrange

-Smolt Quality and Emigration Cues
-Harvest Management
-Endangered Salmon

September 20th 7:00 pm Banquet --Arcata VFW Hall

-Albacore and Chicken Barbeque Banquet--Humboldt Chapter AFS, Arcata VFW Hall.

September 21st 8:00am to Noon --Genetic & Hatchery Practices.
Session chairman - Eric Loudenslager

8:00am Genetic Variation in Chinook Salmon --Devin Bartley

8:40 Genetic Stock Identification of Mixed Fisheries
Jon Brodziak

9:20 Break

9:30 Reproductive Changes in Hatchery Chinook Salmon in Oregon --Dave Hankin

10:10 Aquacultural Genetics of Coho and Chinook Salmon
William Hershberger

10:50 Break

11:00 Chromosome Manipulations of Chinook Salmon Hybrids with Rainbow Trout --Gary Thorgaard

September 22nd — Companion Workshop: Estuary and Oceans
Session chairman - Craig Tuss, USF&WL, Arcata

Location: To be announced
Cost: $7.50 (includes proceedings)

Sponsors: U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Klamath River Restoration Program
Humboldt State University
Humboldt Chapter A.F.S.

9:30am Introduction, Craig Tuss, USF&WL-Arcata

9:45 Role of Estuaries and Wetlands Along the California Coast --Tom Taylor, CA Parks and Recreation.

10:30 Hydraulic Forces that Affect Estuary Productivity
John Largier, Scripts Institute.

11:15 Survival of Salmonids in the Estuary Environment
Terry Hofstra, Redwood Nat. Park.

12:00 Lunch

1:00 Factors Affecting Primary Ocean Productivity
George Crandell, Humboldt State University

1:45 Affects of the Ocean Environment on Survival of Juvenile Salmonids --Bob Francis, University of WA.

2:30 Break

2:45 Food Consumption of Juvenile Salmon in Relation to Food Availability --Rick Brodeur, University of WA.

3:30 To be announced

4:15 Concluding Remarks --Craig Tuss

4:30 Questions and Feedback Session

CONFERENCE GENERAL INFORMATION:

Registration Cost: "Proposed Costs"

Pre-registration General	$40.00
Registration at the Door	$50.00
Student Registration	$15.00
Proceedings Cost (optional)	$20.00
Banquet Cost	$15.00
Field Trip	$15.00
Estuary and Ocean Workshop	$7.50(includes proceedings)

CAL-NEVA CHAPTER RESPONSIBILITIES:

-Publishing Program
-Conference/Workshop Registration Kevin Urquhart, Cal-Neva

HUMBOLDT CHAPTER RESPONSIBILITIES:

-Local Arrangements
-Banquet--Doug Parkinson/Pat Higgins
-Audio-visual Needs--Dave Fuller, Humboldt (707) 442-1721

Shared Responsibilities with Cal-Neva

-Art Show/Exhibits--Pat Higgins, Humboldt (707) 822-0744
Steve Parmenter, Cal-Neva
-Advertisements--Nick Villa, Cal-Neva, Mike Ward and Tom Hasseler, Humboldt (707) 743-1815/468-0674
-Proceedings Editors--Alan Baracco, Cal-Neva and Tom Hassler, Humboldt (707) 822-5330

Humboldt AFS 1990 Salmon Workshop
Planning Committee

Jerry Barnes	Six Rivers N.F.	(work) (707) 442-1721
David Fuller	Six Rivers N.F. 507 F. Street Eureka, CA 95501	(work) (707) 442-1721 (home) (707) 839-5253
Mary Kay Buck	Lower Trinity R.D.	(work) (916) 629-2118
Annelise Carleton	Six Rivers N.F.	(work) (707) 442-1721
Tom Hassler	Coop. Fish Unit Humboldt State University Arcata, CA 95521	(work) (707) 826-3268
Pat Higgins	1271 Fieldbrook Rd. Arcata, Ca 95521	(707) 822-0744
Karen Kenfield	Six Rivers N.F. 507 F Street Eureka, CA 95501	
Eric Loudenlager	Fisheries Dept Humboldt State University Arcata, CA 95521	826-3445
Bill Loudermilk	CA Dept. of Fish & Game 1234 East Shaw Fresno, CA 93710	(209) 222-3761

Mike McCain	Gasquet R.D. P.O. Box 228 Gasquet, CA 95543	(home) (707) 457-3131 (work) (707) 487-9451
Kerry Overton	Six Rivers NF	(work) (707) 442-1721 (home) (707) 822-9417
Doug Parkinson	Box 131 Bayside, CA 95524	(work) (707) 826-0844 (home) (707) 822-8421
Terry Roelofs	Fisheries Dept Humboldt State University Arcata, CA 95521	(work) 707-826-3344 (home) 707-826-3953
Crag Tuss	US Fish & Wildlife Ser. Fisheries Assistance Office 1125-16th Arcata, CA 95521	707-822-7201
Mike Ward	Steiner Env. Consultants Box 250 Potter Valley, CA 93469	(work) (707) 743-1815 (home) (707) 468-0674
Chris Zimmerman	769 Shirley Blvd. Arcata, CA 95521	(707) 822-5330

ATTACHMENT 9

FINAL PLAN FOR INDIAN GILL NET HARVEST OF FALL CHINOOK SALMON ON THE YUROK INDIAN RESERVATION DURING 1990

I. INTRODUCTION

This plan has been prepared as a management aid and to meet the requirements of the Final Environmental Impact Statement Indian Fishing Regulations Hoopa Valley Indian Reservation/California July 1987 (INT F.E.S. 87-29). That document adopted Alternative C as the plan of management for Indian fishing in the Klamath River Basin. Alternative C allows phased commercial fishing and, under that alternative, no commercial fishing will be permitted on any species until a specific harvest management plan has been prepared for that particular fishery which will assure an adequate number of fish for Indian subsistence and ceremonial harvest and for spawning, after taking into account any anticipated in-river harvest by persons not subject to federal regulations.

Indian gill net harvest of fall chinook salmon (salmon) for subsistence and commercial purposes will be included in this plan. Those fisheries will be managed under terms and conditions established by this plan and will be regulated by rules contained in the current 25 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 250 (25 CFR). They may be additionally regulated through a series of formally adopted pre-season and in-season adjustments to those regulations.

Any in-season adjustment will be in effect 24 hours after posting on the "Official Bulletin Board" at the Klamath Field Office. Such an in-season adjustment will also be published as a legal notice in the Eureka Times/Standard newspaper as soon as possible after posting on the official bulletin board.

This plan and attachments have been prepared by fishery biologists from the United States Department of the Interior and is on file at the Bureau of Indian Affairs (Bureau) office at 1900 Churn Creek Road, Redding, California 96002 and at the Klamath Field Office, Klamath, California 96558.

II. BIOLOGICAL AND TECHNICAL BASIS OF THIS PLAN

This plan is based on an allowable harvest number (quota) of fully mature salmon. That quota was provided to the Bureau by the Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) for use by the Klamath River Indians. It was developed by the scientific and technical staff of the Council through extensive analysis of the best available information. Additionally, there was input and consultation with all other management entities and user groups concerned with the management and harvest of Klamath River Basin salmon.

Taking in consideration of the process outlined above, the Bureau believes that conservation and escapement requirements have been considered and that the needs of the other user groups have been provided for and are reflected in the allocation to be used for Indian purposes. Accordingly, no further mention of those requirements will be made in this plan.

III. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC IMPACTS

The Bureau, acting for the Yurok Tribe in the management of this fishery, recognizes that the fishery may have negative as well as positive socio-economic impacts on the local area and on other areas somewhat distant from the Reservation.

Those impacts can be placed into two general categories; impacts resulting from altered sharing patterns (allocations) among competing user groups and impacts which may occur as a result of actual fishing activities, i.e. competition between user groups for time, space, and access to their respective fisheries and fishing areas. Impacts in the first category will generally be felt in the ocean fisheries as "shares" are re-calculated to accommodate the Indian fisheries while impacts in the second category will primarily occur in the estuary area of the Klamath River.

The Bureau does not believe that a Harvest Management Plan is an appropriate mechanism in which to address the issue of allocations between user groups; however impacts which may occur in the second category should be considered in any Harvest Management Plan. In this Plan, emphasis has been placed on shaping the days and hours of fishing in the estuary area of the Klamath River (on the Yurok Indian Reservation) to minimize the potential for conflict between Indian gill net fishers and non-Indian sport fishers. That action has been combined with an early announcement of seasons and fishing times so that all participants, including commercial campground owners, can make appropriate arrangements to accommodate the final seasons in a timely manner. The Bureau believes those actions should minimize negative impacts in the local area.

IV. MANAGEMENT OF THE FISHERY

General Conditions: Participation in any Indian gill net fishery on the Yurok Indian Reservation will be regulated by the existing 25 CFR Part 250, Section 250.5 WITH THE FOLLOWING EXCEPTION: members who are enrolled in the Hoopa Valley Tribe will NOT be permitted to participate in any fishery on the Yurok Indian Reservation which is regulated by the Bureau.

Harvest will be accomplished with gill nets as described in 25 CFR with certain exceptions as established by pre-season and in-season adjustments to those regulations.

Under this plan, from August 6,1990 to October 1, 1990 for regulation of the fishery only, the Yurok Indian Reservation will be divided into two management areas. Area 1 will be the area from the Highway 101 bridge downstream to the ocean and Area 2 will be the area from the Highway 101 bridge upstream to the eastern boundary of the Yurok Indian Reservation.

Schedule of Fishing:

Date	Area 1	Area 2	Explanation
Prior to 8-4-90	Open gillnet Regulated by 25 CFR	Open gillnet Regulated by 25 CFR	Subsistence only Area 1 - 10,000 Area 2 - 6,600
8-4-90 to 8-6-90	Closed gillnet from 8 AM, 8/4 to 7 PM, 8/6	Closed gillnet from 8 AM, 8/4 to 7 PM, 8/6	To create a "break" between subsistence fishing & commercial
8-6-90 until quota(s) are filled	Open to subsistence and commercial fishing 7 PM to midnight 5 nights/week Tues thru Sat.	Open to subsistence only, regulated by 25 CFR Part 250.	When quotas for an area are filled, that area will be closed by an in-season adjustment.
After 10-1-90	Open gillnet Regulated by 25 CFR	Open gillnet Regulated by 25 CFR	Subsistence only

Specific Harvest Management for Area 1: As shown in the Schedule of Fishing above, prior to August 4, 1990, area 1 is open to subsistence fishing only. A quota of 10,000 adult salmon (those fish 24 inches or greater in total length) has been established as the overall subsistence quota for area 1. Under this plan, based on previous fisheries of a similar nature, it is anticipated that the subsistence quota will be filled by late August and area 1 will be closed to Indian gill net fishing throughout September.

From 8:00 AM Saturday, August 4, 1990 to 7:00 PM Monday, August 6, 1990, area 1 and area 2 will be closed to all gill netting. This is to create a short "break" between subsistence fishing and commercial fishing which will be allowed in area 1 after re-opening at 7:00 PM on August 6. This will allow all participants in the commercial fishery an opportunity to start fishing on an equal basis and will deter any "stockpiling" of fish caught just prior to the legal sale period.

On August 6, 1990 at 7:00 PM, area 1 will be open to both subsistence and commercial fishing. Beginning on that date, fishing will be permitted from 7:00 PM until midnight five (5) nights a week, Tuesday through Saturday, until the respective quotas are filled. The commercial quota is 3000 fish which must be 26 inches in total length or over to be offered for sale. The subsistence quota will be the balance of the 10,000 fish quota not taken in the period prior to August 4, 1990.

Based on previous fisheries of a similar nature, it is estimated that the commercial portion of this fishery will be completed in less than five days.

All fishing in this management area will be regulated by 25 CFR Part 250 with pre-season and in-season adjustments as appropriate.

During the period when subsistence fishing and commercial fishing are occurring simultaneously, the days and hours of fishing permitted shall be the same.

Specific Harvest Management for Area 2: Only subsistence fishing will be permitted in this management area. A quota of 6600 salmon, 24 inches or greater in total length has been established. In the event the quota is reached, this management area will be closed through an in-season adjustment until October 1, 1990.

As shown in the Schedule of Fishing above, fishing will be permitted at all times except for a short closure during August 4 and 5 to create a reservation-wide interval between subsistence and commercial fishing.

All fishing in this management area will be regulated by 25 CFR Part 250 with pre-season and in-season adjustments as appropriate.

VI. CONTROL AND MONITORING OF THE FISHERIES

Day to day control of the fishery and technical assistance will be provided by the staff fishery biologist of the Bureau's Northern California Agency at Redding, California.

Monitoring of the fisheries will be accomplished by technical and professional staff from the Fishery Assistance Office of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) at Arcata, California. Monitoring will be conducted at a level which will provide for "real time" accountability of the harvest and which will result in an adequate level of data collection and retrieval of coded-wire-tags. The FWS will report catch and effort statistics to the Bureau for evaluation on a weekly basis.

Enforcement of this plan and the regulations contained in 25 CFR and adjustments to those regulations will be accomplished by qualified law enforcement personnel from the Bureau's Klamath Field Office. The Criminal Investigator from the Klamath Field Office will be the Officer-in-Charge of the law enforcement staff. Warrants, citations and arrests will be prosecuted through the Yurok Court of Indian Offenses at Klamath, California.

The Superintendent of the Northern California Agency will be the line officer in charge of the fishery and the Area Director of the Sacramento Area Office of the Bureau of Indian Affairs will have signatory authority over all pre-season and in-season adjustments to the regulations contained in 25 CFR.

VII. SALE AND MARKETING

Because the Bureau must act for the Yurok Tribal Government in conducting this fishery, some special actions are necessary to insure control and accountability of the portions of this fishery which involve the sale of a tribal asset.

A landing fee of 20 percent of all individual sales of salmon will be collected by the Bureau and deposited in an interest bearing Yurok Tribal trust account for the future use of the Tribal government. To accomplish this Yurok Tribal requirement, it will be necessary for the Bureau to manage and monitor the transportation to the buying station, the actual sale of the fish, the payment to individual fishers, and accountability for fish and funds as they pass through the system.

An established buyer will be selected by the Bureau through a competitive bidding process. The buyer selected must then establish a buying station on or near area 1. All fish offered for sale from this fishery must be sold to the designated buyer at the designated buying station. Delivery to the buying station may be by boat directly from the fishing sites in area 1 or by vehicle under a closely monitored and controlled system initiated and managed by the Bureau's law enforcement officers. NO PRIVATE OR OFF-RESERVATION SALES OF FISH, FISH PARTS OR FISH PRODUCTS FROM THIS FISHERY WILL BE PERMITTED.

Salmon to be sold will be presented at the buying station with the body intact (in-the-round). One price-per-pound will be paid for all fish. Fish will not be graded as to size and the buyer will have the right to reject fish that do not meet commonly established quality control conditions such as freshness or external body damage. No fish under 26 inches in total length may be sold in this fishery.

At the buying station, each fisher will be provided with a completed copy from a four-part receipt/data ticket showing number of salmon sold, weight of fish, price per pound computed with the tribal share deducted and an extension of the amount due the fisher. Within one week the fisher must be paid by the fish buyer by check through the mail or by direct delivery of the check at a pre-determined and mutually agreeable time and place. The Bureau will be provided with a completed copy of each fish ticket for their records.

Before any fish can be sold at the buying station, the fisher must present his/her pictured fishing identification card to the buyer who will verify that the seller is represented by the card. No fisher may represent any other fisher in this process.

At the time of sale, each fisher will be asked a few short questions by the fish buyer regarding any problems they may have encountered with marine mammals during the period of commercial fishing just completed. This will enable the Yurok fishery to comply with a requirement imposed by the Marine Mammal Protection Act.

VIII. OTHER

The Bureau will prepare a final report within six months after the conclusion of this fishery which will include both statistical information on the sale and biological data on the resource as available.

The Superintendent of the Northern California Agency may amend this Plan to delete, change or add item that he/she deems necessary to improve safety, management, enforcement or accountability of the fishery.

Submitted:

Delmar J Robinson Date July 5, 1990
Delmar J. Robinson, Fishery Management Biologist
Northern California Agency, Bureau of Indian Affairs

Approved:

Roy L. Hutsacker Date July 5, 1990
for Carole D. Overberg, Superintendent
Northern California Agency, Bureau of Indian Affairs